## For the Northern District of California

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	TOR THE WORTHERW DISTRICT OF CHER ORIVIN
9	
10	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., No. C 10-03561 WHA
11	Plaintiff,
12	$\mathbf{v}$ .
13	GOOGLE INC., REQUEST RE "CUSTOM" DETAILS
14	Defendant.
15	
16	With respect to "custom," the Court understood open-source to still have licensing
17	restrictions, which included, if you downloaded the open-source code, (i) donating back to the
18	open-source public all improvements by the downloader, and (ii) not selling for profit your own
19	version of what you downloaded. Were these conditions part of the open-source custom or not?
20	If so, how does Google contend it complied with these conditions? Oracle will please address
21	these concerns in its "custom" response due MONDAY, and Google must answer specifically on
22	the above (and any other licensing bars raised by Oracle to any such custom) by TUESDAY AT
23	NOON.
24	
25	0.4
<ul><li>26</li><li>27</li></ul>	Dated: May 1, 2016.  WILLIAM ALSUP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE